

University of Akron Faculty Senate Meeting

February 6, 2014, 3:00 p.m.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The regular February meeting of the Faculty Senate is called to order. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as distributed? Moved by Senator Raber, seconded by Senator Hajjafar. Are there any changes to the agenda to be proposed? Hearing none, I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of adopting the agendas as presented, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Agenda is adopted. The next item is the adoption of the minutes of the November and December meetings. We'll take them one at a time. Is there a motion to adopt the minutes of the November meeting? Moved by Senator Clark. Seconded by Senator Hajjafar. Are there any corrections to the November minutes? All those in favor of adopting the November minutes, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Minutes are adopted. Is there a motion to adopt the minutes of the December meeting? Senator Hajjafar moves. Seconded by Senator Jones. Any corrections to the December minutes? All those in favor of adopting the December minutes as presented, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. December minutes are adopted. Next are my remarks.

First of all, I wanted to welcome to this senate meeting those faculty members who are not members of the senate and not in the habit of attending senate meetings, as well as members of the news media and others who may be present.

For those who are not in the habit of attending meetings of the Faculty Senate, let me just point out that the senate is a relatively formal deliberative body. Senate meetings are conducted in accordance with the senate's bylaws and Robert's Rules of Order.

Today we have four reports from senate committees and one major item of business, the proposed suspension of 55 academic programs. This item is on the agenda under new business. I expect that the president and the provost will address these proposals in their remarks early in the meeting.

As it customary at the conclusion of the president's remarks, senators will have the opportunity to ask questions of him and likewise at the end of the provost's remarks. I do request that those questions not include questions about the proposals insofar as the provost is concerned, because he will be with us for the rest of the meeting. He will be here during the, when we take up the item under new business and has indicated his willingness to respond to questions at that time.

The reason I ask this is that I think it would be difficult to differentiate between questions and debate. And debate is really, really belongs when we take up the item under new business. I don't believe the president will be with us for that debate so insofar as he addresses these questions, and his remarks, questions about those remarks would be in order, although I would indicate that although the president is the one who formally presented these to the senate, because under the bylaws it is he who is entitled to request that an item be put on the agenda and have it put on the agenda, in reality, the, these proposals come from the Office of Academic Affairs. It is that office that is most intimately familiar with them and can respond best to questions about them.

When we reach the item of new business, debate on the merits of the proposals will be in order, but in the end we will need to decide on the process by which we will arrive at recommendations by our senate meeting. I do not expect any decision to be made in this meeting about the merits of any of the 55 proposals. I expect the senate will refer them to committee, which will report its recommendations about those 55 proposals to the senate in time for the senate to act in its April meeting.

There will be an opportunity for concerned faculty members to communicate their concerns to the committee so that those concerns can be taken into consideration by the committee and eventually by the senate.

Under the Faculty Senate bylaws, nonmembers of the senate are not entitled to speak in senate meetings. They may, however, be granted permission to speak. When we take up the proposals under new business, I expect there will be a motion to allow faculty members who are not members of the senate to speak for up to one minute when recognized by the chair.

These proposals present difficult and complicated issues, and in some instances I think are likely to arouse emotions. In the end, though, I think what we're going to need to do is to make reasoned decisions supported by facts about each one of these proposals.

The administration has presented us a set of criteria by which they made the determinations about which programs are to be suspended. In the end we'll need to consider those criteria, decide whether we think those are the appropriate criteria. And then whatever we think in the end are the appropriate criteria, those criteria will make relevant certain facts about each of the individual programs that are being proposed for suspension.

The, in the end the senate, but along the way a committee, if it's referred to committee, will need to have all those facts at hand, and also the particular rationale that supports the administration's proposal for that program so that it can evaluate the soundness of the proposal. That concludes my remarks.

The next item is special announcements. We have, I have two deaths to report. The first is Assistant Head Football Coach Allen Arrington passed away following an automobile accident on Monday, December 23rd in the state of Mississippi. Nicknamed Tank, Arrington was in his second season on Head Coach Terry Bowden's staff and in addition to his assistant head coaching duties also worked with the offensive line. A native of Oxford, Mississippi, he was 44.

Henry Stevens died Saturday morning at the age of 95, six days after falling while walking from his apartment at the Rocky Knoll Retirement Community to the Westminster Presbyterian Church where he had been a member, elder and choir member for 63 years. Mr. Stevens was a native of Austria having served in the Austrian army before immigrating to the United States in 1939.

He received his undergraduate degree in chemistry from Columbia University and a master's and doctorate in chemistry from Western Reserve University. The holder of 40 patents, he worked for PPG Industries for 42 years and began teaching chemistry part time at University of Akron in 1954 and continued through 1963.

Following retirement from PPG he began teaching at the University of Akron again in 1986 and was scheduled to teach his first class of the semester last Thursday. University of Akron officials said Mr. Stevens was the oldest faculty member at the school. He was, he loved singing in the Akron Symphony Chorus and his church choir. He also played bridge, led bird walks and was an avid reader.

Would you please rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of our two deceased colleagues?
Thank you.

Next item on the agenda is the report of the Executive Committee.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Thank you, Chair Rich. Good afternoon, senators and guests. Welcome back. I again will be brief. The Executive Committee met on December 5th and appointed Tim Lillie to the University Review Committee. The committee next met on January 16 for regular senate business and to prepare for the meeting with the president and the provost later that afternoon.

Peter Lavrentyev requested to be removed from the URC and assigned to another committee. He was appointed to the Library Committee unanimously.

Later that afternoon members of the Executive Committee met with the president and provost and vice provost. The president welcomed the EC and informed us of President Obama's

meeting with 150 private universities and colleges to discuss student access, affordability and completion.

The president also informed the EC that Governor Kasich is currently working with the IUC regarding allocation of capital resources for higher education.

The president then updated the EC on the recent changes in the Senior Administrative Structure, including reporting lines and allocation of duties.

The provost provided an update on the status of the assistant provost for online learning position and the online initiative. We also discussed the academic program review and recommendations, summer teaching loads for part time faculty, the summer course schedule, graduate assistant funding levels, retention specialists and the reconfiguration of classrooms.

The EC next met on January 30 for regular senate business and to plan the agenda for today's meeting. The EC appointed Joan Johns to the Athletic Committee, James Diefendorff to the Faculty Research Committee and both Forest Smith and William Hazelett to the Part time Faculty Committee. The EC is also reviewing the proposed academic calendar for Academic Year 15 16. And this concludes my report.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any questions of Secretary Bove about the report? Thank you. Senator Osorio.

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: Could I just know a little bit more about the summer teaching loads for part time faculty?

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Let me look at my notes. What did he say? It's still being processed. Looking at considering a third semester for part time faculty. There's some strong arguments, they're going to have to have some meetings with the Council of Deans and need an okay from HR and the OGC. So it's in process. And maybe the provost or Rex can speak more of that later specifically, and we'll certainly bring more updates as it comes to us.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Any other questions of Secretary Bove about the report? Thank you.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next we have the remarks of the president. Mr. President.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good afternoon, colleagues. Mr. Chairman, thank you obviously as always for recognizing our recently deceased colleagues.

But as you spoke about Hank Stevens, I was reminded that I had the privilege of meeting with him surely within the last year, and he was recognized in the newspaper for much of his work.

He continued to be so very active with his colleagues here on campus and obviously in the community, and we will certainly miss him. Thank you.

I want to address two items that relate to our overall strategic vision and goals and to share with you some information about three other topics. But first I want to share just a little bit of good news.

According to our chief financial officer who I saw come in a little while ago, our spring enrollment was actually a little bit better than we had predicted, and so that means a little less pressure on the budget for this semester, and so that is good news.

Secondly, our tracking of the applications for the freshmen class for 2014 tells us that they are 40 percent above this time last year. And as you know, we've had some new approaches to reaching students and inviting their applications. So it's too early to say how much of that increase in applications would result in increased enrollment, but it is a very encouraging sign for obvious reasons that I'm sure has not escaped your attention.

Indeed those two and many other things that are happening remind us that as I said in my remarks at November when I talked about the state of the university, I will just quote a short passage. As the process for selecting my successor continues, I want to make clear that this institution shall remain productive, energetic during this transition, and in fact it should be obvious to all that challenges old and new press upon us the need to continue to action with a clear focus on goals established in Vision 2020 strategic plan. And these items, as preliminary as they are, certainly suggest that we are on the right path.

So I want to say to all of you who are here and to our colleagues across the university that I recognize how energetically and productively you are pursuing these issues.

In December following my address, we did launch a series of initiatives which are now being talked under the rubric of teams of leaders. And in this six groups of our colleagues have assembled and were charged by me with generating significant progress during this semester to leave the university in its trajectory for improvement and indeed in better shape for my successor. The teams which draw upon members of the administration and the faculty throughout the university focus on the following areas: Academic affairs, innovation, UniverCity as you saw in our annual report, namely partnerships between the university and the community, alumni and development, student success and finance.

All of these teams have set top priorities already and are working to meet those goals by June 30, 2014. And one of those involves indeed the enrollment and advancement to student success.

Another example that I can share with you which relates to your agenda today is that as your chairman has indicated on Tuesday I forwarded to him and to you a report from Provost Sherman

and the Office of Academic Affairs regarding the next steps in our ongoing process of academic program review.

Now, as I am sure Dr. Sherman will tell you, as part of that agenda item our decade long process of academic program review now calls upon this body to provide feedback specifically for proposals to suspend a number of programs.

Let me hasten to add that suspend is not necessarily being sunset or eliminate, as many of you have already been actively working on how to transform those programs or merge them into others or enhance them in other ways. But in any case, as this process continues, I do ask that you provide the feedback of this body at your April 3rd meeting, so that the recommendations can be ready for consideration by the board of trustees at its April 23rd meeting.

Now, I say that, and I reiterate the issue of what suspension means, because we do have responsibilities to both our current and prospective students. The board in that recognition passed a resolution that requires our decisions in this matter of programs because we must advise students of how they may be affected by any decisions, whatever those decisions might be.

And as you know, the national date for college confirmation is May first, so it's simply vital that we keep ourselves moving in an appropriate way to provide notice as notice may be required.

Let me also be clear about one other point. Enrolled students in any program that is either suspended or eventually changed in other ways will be given the opportunity to finish their degree programs as I'm sure you are familiar with that process in the academy.

So let me turn to just three other brief items. Your secretary talked about the capital funding, and I'm pleased to tell you that the Ohio Higher Education Funding Commission, which the governor charged a group of, charged all the presidents of all of the public universities to structure the small body and make recommendations on behalf of all of us, completed its work and has now submitted it on behalf of the public universities our share of that as 18 and a half million dollars exclusive of Wayne College.

And these include projects in revitalizing the law school, research laboratories the Auburn Science and Engineering Centers, investments in electrical infrastructure and maintenance and repair projects throughout the campus and also separately Wayne College.

Secondly, I also want to thank you and everyone here who has contributed to making our seventh annual Rethinking Race Campus Initiative the success that we're seeing it to be. We're almost midway through this two week series of films, speeches, exhibits, discussions and other aspects. Last year about 130 faculty linked their coursework to the Rethinking Race events, and more than 8,000 students and faculty and community members participated or attended these events in one way or another. I am confident that this year's program will do equally well.

And on a related note, I wish to remind everyone that on April 11th and 12th we will host the seventh annual Black Male Summit on our campus. That event has grown larger and better with each year and now includes an impressive slate of national and local speakers and panelists, and I certainly hope that as many of you and other colleagues can be supportive and engaged in that event as well.

Finally, I'm particularly pleased to share with you an event that's coming to our campus in the very near future. As you may know, a few months ago the President asked me to serve on a National Advanced Manufacturing Partnership Steering Committee. It's a small committee of individuals who in turn were asked to select experts within their college. I selected several of our faculty here on campus, one of whom is with us here today, Ajay Mahajan, thank you, Ajay, to participate in the individual, working groups. There are, I believe, five as I recall, that are working on selective aspects of advancing the manufacturing opportunities in this advanced and high technology era for that aspect of our economy.

That group has moved forward to have a first regional meeting this past Monday and Tuesday in Atlanta, Georgia at the Georgia Institute of Technology hosted by my colleague, their president, Bud Peterson. We likewise proposed that we host such an event and they have agreed that on April 2nd the University of Akron, your University of Akron will host the second regional meeting of the Advanced Manufacturing Partnership.

Other regional meetings are expected and they are likely to be hosted by MIT and the University of Michigan, and needless to say colleagues, I hope you agree that we are therefore, or maybe they are therefore in good company.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my remarks. I am happy to address any questions your colleagues may have.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Are there any questions for the president? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: First off, thank you very much, Mr. President. I appreciate your discussion today. I just wanted to make sure that I was clear about one minor item and this stems from what I hope is a misunderstanding.

Page 4 of the document that was proposed to the board and that we have before us appears at the top that defines suspend as quote, "cease admitting new students, permit in place students to complete the program and leading to program closure."

So I wanted to make sure that that was, that was clearly understood that my understanding of what you said is that suspension of admission does not necessarily mean to suspend the program.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: That is correct. It also means that it does not necessarily mean that it will not be sunsetted and closed. But you are correct. And your dean has spent some time

clarifying that matter, and as you know in these issues, the opportunity to be misunderstood is boundless, so we endeavor to move forward. I am particularly delighted that your dean has communicated on some very, very fine work that's ongoing. So let's see where you take it, and let's see where the data take us as well.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you for helping to clarify that.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: You are very welcome. Thank you as well.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any other questions for the president?

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Thank you very much. Stay warm.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Mr. Provost.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Good afternoon, everybody. Chair Rich, if I might, we had a Council of Deans meeting this past Tuesday at which we discussed the question related to part time faculty. And as the faculty have become aware of and have known to expect, there will be a debrief of that meeting sent to all the faculty as we've been doing where we'll clarify the answer to that question. And I anticipate that that will be distributed on Monday.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: So the answer has been arrived at?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I believe it's very close. I believe we still have one outstanding question with HR. But I think it's very close.

As a way of introduction related to academic program review, let me say that I, we appreciate the hard work and diligence of the faculty, the chairs, the directors the deans and certainly many others through the process of academic program review. I certainly would be remiss if I didn't thank the hard work and the persistence of the Academic Program Review Committee that was chaired by Dean Midha.

I acknowledge, we acknowledge this is not an easy step in the process, but is well informed and due diligence continues by receiving input from Faculty Senate. I've been more informed and educated about our academic programs via the responses to the academic program review recommendations that were submitted by the chairs and the directors, as well as my conversations with the deans and the dean of the graduate school and vice president for research in consideration of those recommendations and observations.

Consequently the Faculty Senate can expect on our collective behalf the cooperation and involvement of chairs and directors and deans as senate carries out its work. They will be at your disposal.

This is the baseline for a process that will continue in ongoing cycles that will produce actionable recommendations. As we all know, this is an expectation of the Higher Learning Commission and the Board of Regents Council on Research and Graduate Studies.

What is academic program review? Certainly it's the opportunity for the institution to examine academic programs from multiple perspectives, relevance, vitality, vibrancy, sustainability, and alignment with strategic direction. While ongoing and very many, faculty initiated innovative academic program adjustments reallocates resources within the program. And institutional level review creates the opportunity for the reallocation of resources across the university.

Academic program review is about reviewing programs on a case by case basis considering the criteria most relevant for each specific program. It's being accountable to the state, our students and our institution about the utilization of resources, human talent, space, equipment and operations. It's about the alignment of the University System of Ohio expectations of the University of Akron, from the Strategic Plan for Higher Education 2008 to 2017 where it states University of Akron, a STEM intensive institution, has long focused on the industries that would transform Akron from the rubber capital of the world to a city and region brimming with potential in polymers, advanced materials and engineering.

Over the last decade it has significantly increased its research portfolio and gained national recognition as an exemplar institution for its productivity and technology transfer in commercialization and continued strong focus on areas that innovate basic and applied research, entrepreneurial education, intellectual property law and technology transfer expertise that is critical to the future of economic prosperity of the city and northeastern Ohio.

Academic program review is not about comparing one program to another. It's limited to a consideration of only certain criteria relevant to that program such as enrollment, revenues, expenses, faculty number, and availability of subsidy.

For example, one might consider the fact that the doctoral program in history no longer benefits the institution from state subsidy.

And speaking of subsidy, it's appropriate to mention that the Ohio Revised Code 3345.061 sunset for state operating subsidies for remedial courses that states, beginning with undergraduate students who commence undergraduate studies in the 2014 15 academic year, no state university listed in Section 3345.011 of the Revised Code except Central State University, Shawnee State University and Youngstown State University shall receive any state operating subsidies for any academic, remedial or developmental courses for undergraduate students, including courses prescribed in the Ohio Core Curriculum for Ohio school graduation under division section of the Revised Code except for as provided by other divisions.

Academic program review is not just about reducing expenses. It's not about eliminating faculty positions. It's not about closing departments. It's not about determining what will be enhanced

as that will happen over time, as suspended programs finish out the students and those programs. It is not about the result of the institutional budgetary situation as an ongoing and continuous improvement process.

The academic program review process was and is completed in 2010, but without taking actions due to provost level leadership transitions, but many programs were flagged with concerns. The current process beginning in 2010 is inclusive, responsive, respectful, collegial, objective and transparent.

For this cycle, the programs updated all academic program review materials and data and responded to observations and recommendations from that previous review. The Academic Program Review Committee considered updated materials and met with each chair and director to learn more about the programs and to address questions about the programs. The Academic Program Review Committee transmitted its recommendations to the provost and the Office of Academic Affairs in April of 2013.

All materials, as you know, were at that point in time posted on a Share Point site and made available to campus via instructions provided by me in a memo sent in May.

I then solicited written responses from departments and schools to those Academic Program Review Committee observations and recommendations, and those were transmitted to me via the dean of each college.

I then interacted with the dean of each college to understand and learn about programs and consideration of all materials and documents.

As we all know, in the meantime, the dean of the graduate school and vice president for research released an assessment of graduate programs that was taken into consideration in the process of developing proposals for program adjustments. I also discussed those recommendations and assessments with the Dean of the Graduate School and the Vice President for Research.

The provost and OAA then transmitted a list of programs proposed for suspension to the president for consideration by faculty senate. That is that transmittal earlier this week.

Just yesterday the board of trustees passed the resolution recognizing the important role of the faculty senate in the next step of the process to inform final recommendations that will be entertained at the board of trustees meeting April 23rd of 2014, and also expecting that appropriate interactions will occur with students who have applied to the programs and at the appropriate time those students who are in those programs.

At this point in time I'm providing a copy of my remarks along with a notebook of academic program review materials associated with those proposed suspensions that exist on the Share Point site and copied from there. That includes comments about the academic program review recommendations. It includes all data sets. It includes the department responses to the academic

program review recommendations. This makes it easier for the senate to have those materials without having the need to go through the Share Point site and find files and folders that are relevant to those programs proposed for suspension.

I'd like to now comment about the programs proposed for suspension. While we've heard the number 55, that includes degrees, tracks of degrees, concentrations and specializations. If we only considered degrees, it's actually 27 degree programs. If we consider those programs for which the faculty has already voted to approve suspension of admissions, there are really 19 programs under consideration for suspension.

Academic program review will result in stronger focus on the mission identified in university rule, and enhance via Vision 2020 the new gold standard for university performance. It will result in improved academic programs because of improved alignment with resources, completion and placement of students from those programs. The remaining steps in the process are the receipt of input from faculty senate, the presentation of final recommendations to the board of trustees at its April 23, 2014 meeting.

And now let me reflect briefly on my own personal experiences related to academic program review across my own academic career.

Very early in my career as a program coordinator and graduate studies chair I was responsible for developing an action plan and executing that action plan based upon a very significant and focused and substantial academic program review of the School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation. As a faculty member I participated in the college reorganization that moved the College of Education from five departments and a school to just three schools.

And then as a school director I had to annually review academic programs for maintenance, possible enhancements and possible deactivations. As vice provost I was involved in the final recommendations of the review of doctoral programs. Now as provost I'm reflecting upon those previous experiences and acknowledging the anxiety and concern that are naturally being felt by those potentially affected.

I resolve, I promise that I will continue to listen closely to the additional and valued input to be received from the faculty senate. You may recall that I've often said any university can do anything, but no university can do everything. This is about fine tuning that which we will continue to do for reasons that we understand.

And finally, I implore that we all keep in mind and remember that as we continue this process, we need to do what's right for ourselves, but on behalf of our students and the state. Mr. Chair, that concludes my comments. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. In accordance with my previous request, are there questions of the provost that do not pertain to the academic program review that we're about to take up under new business? Thank you.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next we have committee reports. We have four informational reports, one from the University Libraries Committee. Is there any oral report in connection with that? One from the Ad hoc Committee on Faculty Research Policy. Is there any oral report on that? Or I should ask any, does anyone wish to raise any questions about that or say anything about it? Okay.

We have an informational report from the Part time Faculty Committee. Is there an oral report to go with that? And we have an informational report from the Faculty Research Committee. Is there an oral report on that? Okay.

Report from the University Council representatives. Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: There are three faculty members on the University Council and I am just representing my, a report. It's not a joint report. So since the last meeting of this senate we've had a meeting.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson, I think you might need to speak a little louder.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: We've had a meeting of University Council. It was, if I remember rightly, a quite short meeting, which meant of course that there were not major issues brought up at that meeting.

We have, I will pass on to you, that all of the committees of University Council have been asked to come up with their planning goals, and at least two to three items which will be brought to the next meeting which is next week on items that they will be working on.

Something I will pass on to you that you may have noticed was not at the last meeting but that the bylaws of University Council, which were originally sent to the board in 2012.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: 2012, I believe.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: 2012, have now again been put on hold until we, until the new president comes to the university. So we are not working under past bylaws for our existence.

One thing that people have brought to several of us is questions relating to the budget for fiscal year 2015 that will be coming up again in the end of the summer or at least sorry, the middle of the summer. And we plan to ask about that at the next meeting of University Council.

What we would like to have from members of this body is the, that you would be, appreciate information on that budget, that we could bring back, we are three members of a body of which there are over 30, so we are a minority. But we would like to have the support of you, the faculty senate, in asking for information about the budget. And therefore, I bring to your attention a motion.

The motion is that the Faculty Senate requests that its representatives on University Council ask that the University Council Budget and Finance Committee present their analysis and recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 budget to UC as soon as possible so that they can report back to Faculty Senate before the summer. So we are

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: We have a motion by Senator Erickson. Is there a second? Seconded by Senator Lillie. Senator Erickson, did you wish to continue?

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I think that represents, as University Council representatives we'll be asking that question, but we would like to be doing it as something that is of concern to members of this body.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Is there debate on the motion? Hearing none, I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Chair is not aware of any unfinished business. Does anyone wish to correct the Chair on that matter?

Next is new business. We have one item of new business and that is the academic program review already mentioned.

The president has proposed the suspension of the 55 academic programs and provost is correct, this does not mean 55 degrees, but the, this is literally a proposal to suspend 55 programs. So I will continue to use that number with the understanding that I don't mean just degrees.

As I indicated at the beginning of the meeting, in the end we will need to decide on a process for reviewing these proposals and arriving at recommendations about each one of them. But I know that there are some people who are interested in addressing the body, some of whom are no doubt senators, some of whom are not senators, and I don't wish to deny anyone a brief opportunity to speak to the merits of the proposal before we move on to what I assume will be a referral to committee.

Is there a motion to allow faculty members who are not members of the senate to speak for up to one minute to address these proposals when recognized by the chair? Moved by Senator Allen, seconded by Senator Jones. Is there debate on the motion? Hearing none, I take it you are ready Senator Osorio.

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: Does this mean they're limited to one minute?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: It means that they would be limited to one minute. Let me ask you this. How many non senators are there here who would like to, by show of hands who would like to speak? Well, in that case, I don't see the need, if there's really only one, I don't see the need to limit that person to one minute.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: You can give that person two minutes.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I think what I'll do is when the time comes, and the person seeks recognition, I will ask if there's any objection to the person speaking. And we won't be so formal as to establish a time limit unless there's objection to that. Okay. Debate is now in order on the proposals. Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you very much. Just the, essentially the same comment that I made with regard to the president, but I want to expand on it just a little bit. And I hope not to take more than just a minute or two.

As the president had outlined and as we had worked very hard since the beginning of the particular academic year in the College of Education, we were aware that due to a variety of circumstances including academic program review, financial resources being limited, reduction in students and just the general fact that time marches on and not everything stays the same, that one of the things we needed to do is to seriously look at the programs that we had in the College of Education.

In particular in my department the Department of Curricular and Instructional Studies, we had several very thorough, in depth, and I think the word used in this regard are lively discussions, about whether or not there were programs or certificates or degrees that we thought were either unimportant or could be done away with easily.

We did, as you might be, not be surprised, we did not see anything that we did as being so unimportant that it would be easy to do away with it.

We did continue having the discussions understanding the pressure, being very thoroughly briefed and being given the chance to absorb some of these new ways of thinking, and I think that we came up with a, and I'm speaking only for my department right now and only for the suspensions of, or the proposed suspensions of the Foreign Language French and Spanish undergraduate and graduate licensure and degree programs, and toward the Ph.D. programs in

elementary and secondary education. So I want to make it clear that that's all I'm referring to at this point.

We, I don't know that any of us are, in our department would have said that those programs need no change. Again, after that thorough debate and discussion, we decided that we would recommend that new admissions to the programs be suspended, and with the understanding that the program admission suspension process had historically gone through the curriculum review process, which would allow for the kind of debate and discussion so that everybody on campus would be aware of and have a chance to work through these issues.

The same thing applied for the Ph.D. programs as well. When we voted as a department to suspend new admissions to those programs, it was explicitly, and I checked on this today with people who were there at the time and also looking at the approved minutes from that meeting. It was explicitly with the understanding that we would have the opportunity to review and revise those programs.

The surprise I felt when as I mentioned to the president, I read this report with the suggestion, not the suggestion, the definition of suspension meaning that that meant that the program would be closed, surprised me. Not because the program was on the list, but because further down on Page 4 there's an asterisk that would lead a reader to assume that the suspended, that the suspended admissions in the programs marked with an asterisk were done at the action of the faculty.

And certainly it's true that we voted to suspend admissions, but that was number one the first step in the process. And number two, it was with no intent whatsoever, and I can tell you I felt a sense of, well, a very sinking sense, put it that way, when I read the new definition of suspend, that that was seen as the equivalent of a program closure.

So one of the things that I wanted to do was to make sure that that was as clear as we could possibly make it. I've consulted with my colleagues at my department. We've talked about this at some length today by E mail and we feel very strongly about it, and wanted to make sure that that was addressed.

Having said all that, it doesn't mean as the president pointed out that we won't end up with program closures that we don't like, but I think it's really important for the future of this process to make sure that it's clear that what appears to be here, what appears to be suggested here is what the faculty did may have been a misunderstanding of what the faculty actually did, and that that needs to be corrected as we move forward. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Does anyone else wish to be recognized? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: Yes. I've got a question, this is really for the provost, about the timing of this. We've been doing program review for nine years. I was chair nine

years ago. I started in for the history department. We've had, it was officially wrapped up after five years. I know the state says we're supposed to do it every five years. We probably should have started over five years ago.

I wonder why we're suddenly doing it now? This seems like the worst possible time to be announcing that with a fairly short period for faculty to respond, that we're listing 55 programs for closure. This does not look good at all.

We've got theoretically a new president going to be coming in, although I saw in the paper that they haven't even started interviewing yet. I'm on the, I'm a senate representative to the Search Committee so I think I probably would have heard. And what we're going to have is a president to be arriving or arriving for the interviews in the middle of a faculty being very upset. Because I think Senator Lillie's remarks suggested, and he was trying to be diplomatic about it, you've got faculty over in Education and I know for a fact over in Arts and Sciences, too, they're feeling, wait a second. The rug is being pulled out from under us. We do not want to be interviewing presidential candidates for, when the university is up in arms and the faculty are distraught.

The accreditors are coming back next month. One of the things that the accreditors had worried about was the administration/faculty interaction. The accreditors are going to arrive in the middle of faculty being distraught.

I think the timing on this is really bad. And I would sort of hope the administration could rethink this idea of putting it to the board this fast. That sure, they can put out this idea and that then we can have a discussion. What's wrong with the new discussion continuing with a new president and new provost and new administration?

Closing down 55 programs whether or not they're all degree programs, is a really serious step. And the fact that program review has been going on for nine years, essentially the faculty figures okay, it's going along and every now and then we get questions.

I 13 months ago was one of those chairs asked to give feedback. So I figured, that was 13 months ago. They haven't done anything with it. And all of a sudden, whoa, here it is. We're gonna do this really fast, guys. We don't need to do it really fast. If it's taken us nine years, it's not going to hurt us to do it for another year.

And I think that given all of the things that Dr. Sherman said about how this program review does not mean saving money, does not mean this, does not mean getting rid of bad programs. What it does mean in terms of value? I have yet to hear anything that is so compelling that we must do it now.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Yes. Would you please state your name?

MARIA ALEJANDRA ZANETTA: Yes. Maria Alejandra Zanetta. I'm the new Chair of the Department of Foreign Languages, and I'm really glad that I'm here because just to listen to what

my colleagues [inaudible] had to say about that program. We were really dismayed to find the foreign language education program on that list, because I don't know that you know, I tried to spread the word, but the American Council of Foreign Language Teachers has recognized our program as one of the best in the nation. Granted it's not a big program, but it has a 100 percent placement.

And one of the aspects of this program that was recognized nationally was that the program was so good because we closely collaborated with the College of Education and the College of Education with Arts and Sciences and between departments.

So in order for us to learn that this very important program in which we really, really put a lot of effort and time was going to be suspended without our input was really a terrible thing for us.

And not only because it directly impacts us in terms of [indiscernible] enrollment but just a lack of recognition of its evident quality to all of the other institutions, but not ours. So that kind of hurt us.

And I think that this and everything, a problem with the way that the process is working right now. When you propose a new course, you have to go through different steps in order to get this course approved and get the feedback from different units and that makes the, the proposal the more stronger and better for the university because precisely you get this feedback from your colleagues.

But the same thing is not going on when you are thinking of suspending programs that affect different units in different colleges. So I think that is beyond the, these two programs that are being discussed. It's just to think about the process, because on one hand we are hearing okay, we want departments to collaborate across colleges, but this process is not [indiscernible] that type of collaboration because the decisions are, now we are learning that that was not even a decision that was taken by faculty in the College of Education, so that was basically my comment. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Klein.

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: In support of actually the comments that were just made, there's a section of Vision 2020 that I would just like to read as a reminder when we are considering which programs to cut, because it appears that many of the very successful programs are on the chopping block without recalling a key section of Vision 2020. It's just very brief.

So it says "The university experience will reflect a global and multi cultural mindset. For our students to succeed in a global marketplace, they must understand and appreciate cultural, racial and ethnic differences that contribute to an increasingly complex and interconnected world. We will develop more international learning opportunities and exchanges for students and faculty so that acquired knowledge can advance human well being on a global scale. We will promote

innovative teaching and learning of world languages and cultures across a variety of disciplines, encourage collaborative research among nations and foster intellectual and cultural interactions on campus and abroad."

That's just one relevant section that I would like to remind people of in this debate. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: Well, I would like to speak to the issue of the fact that we have here 55 different programs that each are on this list for different reasons. Some have been issues for a number of years. Some are on this list because of retirements, some are on this list because of changes in resources. But there are multiple reasons. And they're not all equal for each program. And I think one of the biggest problems is we don't have the context for a lot of the reasons for the decisions on this list. And I think that is a problem.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Feldt.

SENATOR KEVIN FELDT: I would echo my fellow senator. Four of the programs that are on the list for suspension are applying to me so I thought I might want to comment on that. And that how it made it to the list is a little bit of a mystery, because we have a lot of student production hours. The program needs some help in re structuring. We started that last semester, but certainly we can't completely turn everything around in just 15 weeks.

So we have to change some prerequisites, we have to change some scheduling and order of courses, but the program has a lot of student credit hour production that we want to fix, but we somehow got on that list before we had a chance to show our plan to everybody. So as my fellow senator said, the context of why the programs made the list and are all very, very different. And at least ours may have been prematurely put on there.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Witt.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Several questions. Several questions. I will just start if I could. One has to do with the Share Point data that we can all take a look at now. As I looked through it, I found that the most recent data on there is from 2013. And we've got several interactions with the dean and then the dean and the provost since then, and that's nowhere to be found. I'm hoping it's in that notebook there.

And I'm also hoping that data will somehow be made available to the faculty so they can get a better idea of how the suspension list came about. Our first look at the 2013 program review for our department in no way matches what finally came out of the report that was just turned around.

And also we've tried multiple times as faculty members to write the data sets where we felt they were inadequate, only, and we wrote reports and they just seemed to go nowhere in terms of faculty response and interaction, that sort of thing.

I'm also concerned and I'd like for someone to explain what it is we're saving by program review. If this is a resource question, which I think it was, we could better put resources in other areas by thinking things through a little bit, and I'd like to know exactly if there's any kind of target amount or, you know, what is going to be saved by this.

My faculty are wondering since our graduate program is affected, how, since our department's like a lot of others, this is a big social system that we have here and when you change one aspect of it, it has reverberative changes going throughout the university. And in the case of our graduate program being suspended, this affects our ability to do research, because we tend to do research with graduate students that we'll no longer have. The service courses that we proposed for graduate students will no longer be offered I assume, right? I'm not sure that we'll need graduate faculty staffs for anything.

So there's a lot of questions about our survivability in the future even though we're not scheduled for suspension completely. And one of those has to do with if we lose our graduate program, does this also mean that we now concentrate on what's left and do the very best we can with that? Or do we try to continue to be graduate faculty in spite of the fact that we have no program to be faculty of? And I could go on, but I'll just stop there.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Let me just follow up on one point made by Senator Witt and ask Provost Sherman, does the notebook that you handed me include material that's not on the Share Point site?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: No. All of the material in the notebook is on the Share Point site.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Senator Allen.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: My understanding is that our, we have a biannual subvention funding for graduate studies. And that when I went into the Share Point site and looked at how many degrees were granted in at least the three doctoral programs in education, it was a concern to me even if one thought, well, you could retool it or you could even reallocate those dollars that there would be a vacuum there and we would have two or three cycles that we would lose substantial doctoral subsidy from the state that would prevent us from having the same type of graduate education.

And I was just wondering if that had been considered, the ramifications for dropping all of these yearly graduates that would then have a feedback loop into our subvention.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: In light of the provost's comment on, that the material there is only what was on the Share Point site, I wanted to in this case which I wouldn't have otherwise said, I, like Senator Witt, but my department was not involved, so it was quite separate.

But one of our alumni asked me about a program in another college. And I thought oh, that was being dropped, and she was interested in finding out why because she was concerned. So I went to the Share Point site and followed the materials. And I had the same experience as Senator Witt. I went through the reports from the program review, and the update for 2013, and at this point all of the comments about the program that she was concerned about were all how great it was, how positive it was, and no suggestion at all that it be dropped. And then it is on the list.

So somewhere we need some extra information than what is on the Share Point site, because as I said, yours is the second situation where I can't, I haven't looked at all of them, but this certainly was one where there's a big gap, no in fact documentation is why despite, despite the program review it was, it is recommended for dropping.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Mr. Provost, as I understand it, the material, and it's a question at the end of this which will be if I misunderstood anything, the material in the Share Point site is the material that's produced by the Academic Program Review Committee and produced and gathered by the Academic Program Review Committee, and it's essentially the, one of the inputs to your office, and it was considered by your office in making these proposals, deciding which programs to propose to suspend.

It's also my understanding that in some instances, I don't know how many, the proposal is not what was proposed in the documents that came out of the academic program review. They differ in some instances. Am I correct so far?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: That's correct.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Okay. So what I think is missing and the senate and the committee to which this matter has referred will need is a statement of the basis for the decision by the Office of Academic Affairs especially to the extent that it differs from what was recommended by the Academic Program Review Committee.

Is there other discussion? Senator Witt? Senator Lazar has not spoken yet. Excuse me. Senator Lazar.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Thank you. I do want to thank everyone for all the work and thought that they've put into this process. I want to start by saying that I represent the University Libraries so we have no skin in this game, and I approach this from a faculty member looking at the information and interested in the process. And I too wanted to mention about the missing

context that I had been asked about by several of my fellow librarians who are also faculty members.

I did the same exercise, and I went through and I looked at some of the recommendations and I attempted to find rationales in what was given on the Share Point site that weren't to be found. I am also worried that there were consultant reports that had been mentioned in the media reports that I did not find on the Share Point site.

Some of the recommendations mirror these consultants' reports, even though they have been stated to have been one factor, not the deciding factor, but again, just another input. And I see that as another reason to increase that information and to give context.

And when I was looking at that, I was actually very impressed by, I think it's one of our subcommittees who are looking at the institutes and centers, and I looked at that Excel spreadsheet that they provided and I thought, this is what I want. This is what I want for our academic program review.

I would also like to mention the comment about this is not to discuss the enhancements, the academic program review was covering the suspensions, the maintenance and the enhancements, while as this proposal is only dealing with the suspensions. One of the first questions I received is also, what are we enhancing? What are we getting back?

And I do understand that, you know, we're taking this a step at a time, but I personally was very interested in again that larger context. Not being in education, I don't see that maybe the elimination of all of these projects is really whittling down to come up with a great project. I don't see that context.

And so I think if I as a senator don't understand that going back and looking at Share Point, I don't know how to explain it to my other faculty members and I sure as heck, I'm going to have a difficult time explaining it to the people who are reading on USA Today that we're getting rid of all these programs.

So I'm looking for the integrity of our process as well as how we look. Because I want to, I want to, and for the most part am proud of my institution. But as a senator, you know, it is out there that they're saying this is going to the senate. The senate is going to make a recommendation. And I want to be as well informed as I can, and I also want to be involved. So I would really ask that we please have some more of that information made transparent so that we can really embrace our shared governance rule and be able to make a good contribution to this process.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Witt.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Yeah, I can just make this even a lot easier. As far as any report that comes from Faculty Senate, I would like for it to include in detail what the charges are for

each one of the programs scheduled for suspension. And the truth is we can't defend ourselves if we don't know what we're charged with.

And I think that's been the case in my department all along. We've tried really hard to ask, what is it we need to show in order to, in order to, you know, to meet muster. And we've never been given, every time we've been given a measure we meet it and then nothing seems to happen. So just, this is supposed to be a data driven process as I recall, right? So let's just see the data. It ought to be pretty easy to do.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Schulze.

SENATOR PAMELA SCHULZE: In my school, we were given two pages to explain our worthiness to continue to exist for all of our programs, undergraduate and graduate. That was not sufficient to explain all the data we had to share to show how well we produce for this university. And I would like to, in order to make my best case for my programs to the senate, be able to add to what's on the Share Point site given that, you know, the two programs that have been selected for suspension, we probably only were able to give maybe a paragraph to in order to provide information about their effectiveness and viability. So that's my question, if whether or not we can add.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Schulze, I'm certain that whatever committee this is referred to will give an opportunity to faculty members who are concerned about these particular recommendations to provide additional information and offer additional argument. I cannot imagine that a rational consideration of these proposals would not entail that. Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the provost or perhaps someone else could tell us whether or not given some of the discussion that we've had today, if the report may be amended to either remove the impression that the recommendation to suspend admissions by the faculty is somehow linked to program closure, or to indicate that they may be separate and distinct recommendations.

I ask that question of the provost because this report is what was presented to the board. So from an official point of view, the board has the document from the president and the provost that says something that may actually not be giving the entire story to the people who may eventually have to determine this. So is there the opportunity, Mr. Chair, for this to be, to be corrected? Can we ask the provost if that will occur?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Do you wish to respond, Mr. Provost?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I will certainly take that under consideration.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Jones.

SENATOR DWAYNE JONES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In this we've been given a list of programs that are pending suspension, possible termination. I have a question. Is there a master plan about what our university will look like after this is done and the ultimate goal which we're seeking to accomplish so that when we are considering these suspensions we can look to whether or not these goals are being met?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: Well, as a developmental psychologist I'd like to just rise to say that how can a university of our magnitude and size not have a program in child and family development, and a graduate program in family and child development?

First of all, there's a 40 year history of that department where many people have been trained very successfully to work with children and actually some of the joint programs with the College of Education have trained individuals in terms of child day care, and other things that some of these overlap with Summit College.

I think we also have to look at what does it look like today? How in 2014 can we have a major university that is not focusing on child development and family studies? There are issues right across the life span. Family care giving, family support, divorce, child support. I mean, it is absurd that we would drop a major area like this.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Yes.

MARIA ALEJANDRA ZANETTA: Just one more minute. Just as a follow up to your comment, we were very surprised at the emphasis, again, we felt that the emphasis was placed more on the suspension and not on the process of improvement, because it says here that part of academic program review is to make this program that, it's seen as not probably as strong as they could be, as a way of making them stronger. So this process of not being able to discuss with our colleagues and explore ways to not only save the programs but make them even better and bigger, it has been very surprising to us. Well, I'm talking about the foreign language ed program and our program.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Yes, Senator Ducharme.

SENATOR HOWARD DUCHARME: From the president and provost's comment, that puts us under all kinds of pressure. It seems to me at least taking it at face value of the April 23rd to have a reply from this body to give to them by April 23rd so that he can then report it the next day or whatever to the board of trustees so that they can act on it

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Excuse me. Just to correct that statement, the board resolution calls for the senate to make its recommendations by our April 3rd meeting, so that the president may take them into account and then report, submit his recommendations to the board for decision as its April 23rd meeting. So our deadline is April 3rd and then the board meeting is April 23rd.

SENATOR HOWARD DUCHARME: Okay. So then that makes my point still then that either to offer a request for some type of proposal or motion, but at least for consideration that this body not assume that what needs to be delivered by April 3 is a list of agreement to suspend, you know, 16 but not the others, et cetera, et cetera. No, my request is for consideration that that not be the goal objective that needs to be delivered by April 3. Right?

Rather that, like Connie's comment, what is this such a rush all of a sudden? There's a business principle when you are going to fire somebody, do it fast. Okay? But there's a Godfather reply, you know, it does involve people. It's not just business. So I would suggest that we take a little Godfather advice here if there's a little bit of people and humanity involved and let's slow it down.

>>: Take the cannoli.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: I've got a question for Dr. Sherman. This is a technical question. I know that the president can veto any recommendation from the senate. So is it your feeling from the people that have been working on this that they'll thank the senate so much for their input and then proceed to have 55 suspensions?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Do you wish to respond, Mr. Provost?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I would say the answer to almost all of the statements and comments are reasonably responded to in my statement at the beginning. So I recommend we make my statements at the beginning available to the senate, where I think you would find that this is an iterative process where we anticipate to receive a response that can more fully inform the final recommendations.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Let me add that my own view is that it would be a mistake to pass up the opportunity to make recommendations about these programs and perhaps save some of them. I think it is of course possible the president will disagree with our recommendations and make recommendations to the board that differ from ours. That's always a possibility.

And I, I think the concerns that have been expressed about the short period of time for this body to consider these recommendations, especially in light of how long this process has taken up until now are well taken.

I guess I tend to look at it from a more practical or should I say pragmatic point of view, and that is my fear is that if we essentially pass up the opportunity to make recommendations about whether to suspend these 55 programs that they will be suspended without our recommendations.

And I do think it's possible, call me naively optimistic, but I do think it's possible that in some instances, in fact I think it's very likely. I will go further. I think it's very likely that in some

instances we will make recommendations that differ from those in this report and that our rationale for differing will be so strong that the president will choose to follow, I don't say in every instance but in some instances. Senator Saliga.

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: I'm having a very hard time as I read through this report several times as to accepting it on any level. If any of our students would give us something like this, where there is no justification within it as to why these were chosen, no reason as to what, you know, it says this is a process where we are to enhance and maintain and suspend. I'm probably not using the right words here, but we need the full picture to just talk about what we're going to suspend, well, what are we going to enhance?

You know, I think we need all of it. Not just the suspensions, but okay, who's going, you know, where are we going to put, you know, put additional resources? Having an engineering school, you know, a good engineering school without any graduate programs in physics is absurd. You know, we're not going to get physics faculty. And physics is a very fundamental part of engineering.

You know, there was a statement somewhere, and I can't remember of all these things I've read lately with it about not being able to get a physics chair. Who would want to be a chair of a department that might not have a program at all?

You know, we're in a bit of a cycle here that's not good. But I would like for us to be given all the information there and we do need to make recommendations. I agree. If we don't do anything or ask for more time, they're gonna do what they wish. We've seen it before. Thanks.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I think as I indicated earlier, what is missing and indicated in my E mail that I think you all saw, what is missing, you know, is the particular reasons why each of these programs were selected for suspension.

To some extent those reasons may be provided in the materials on the Share Point site, and they're in the notebook. But I think it's clear from what's been said today that in at least some if not many instances that will not be true.

And so we do need the information that the stated criteria for these decisions make relevant. And we need that information about each individual program that is proposed for suspension. That includes the numerical data like enrollment and completion rates, but also the administration's views about why a particular program, for example, may not be central to the university's mission. Or the other criteria that were stated.

Without that, I don't see how we can sensibly evaluate these proposals. And so I think this body must insist on receiving that information in very short order given how long or how short a period I should say, we have to respond to this. This is absolutely, this is absolutely essential.

Whether we can also obtain information about what programs would be enhanced or invested in may depend in part on, may depend on whether there are any such proposals at this point that have been formulated. And I would therefore now ask the provost, has the administration arrived at, I don't say share, but arrived at proposals or concrete ideas about which programs will be enhanced?

Obviously if the answer is no, then we're not gonna be able to get that information. Mr. Provost?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Well, the reason I referenced my statement is because the answer to that question is academic program review is not about determining what will be enhanced as that will happen over time, as suspended programs finish out students in those programs.

So there is no decision about enhancement at this point in time because there's no resources available to enhance programs. As resources become available, as programs are suspended, they'll obviously be redirected to enhance programs.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lazar.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: May I then ask of the provost, those listed final reports that were submitted on the Share Point site, a few of which did recommend that programs be invested, are they no longer valid or will be completely reconsidered? How are we to view that information from those original reports?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Mr. Provost.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: If I recall correctly, the programs recommended for enhancement as a result of the Academic Program Review Committee recommendations were integrated via sciences, speech language pathology and audiology and nursing.

So as there were no programs recommended for or proposed for suspension in those programs, there aren't by virtue of the process, resources available to invest in them. So to figure out how to invest in them otherwise we'll have to figure out how to redirect institutional resources.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Mr. Provost, what I'm not understanding right now, and I do understand that, you know, only after the program is suspended would resources be available to deploy elsewhere. We're talking right now about a future event, which is program suspension.

Similarly, one can talk now about a future event, program enhancement. That, of course, even though our ability to do it depends upon the freeing up of resources with which to do it, is it your view that those plans cannot be made, plans cannot be made until the resources have actually been freed up by program suspensions?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I think those kind of plans have to be considered as we develop fiscal year 15 budgets and beyond.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: And they have not to date, I take it.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Well, they certainly can be as we develop the 15 budget.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Well, my question is have they been to date?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: No, because we haven't developed the 15 budget.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Anyone else wish to, Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I had one, I guess given, Mr. Chair, given that you had said that we needed to have rational analysis of those decisions, I have to say as an economist that when you decide something you always look at the opportunity cost of the resources that are involved.

And in this case I think you are saying as clearly the resources from, I don't know, the classics program are not going to go over to nursing, that this is going to be redistribution and no one is going to be fired. So we're talking about what are the opportunity costs of those resources? What can they do if we freed those up, where would they go and what would be the great thing that they could do?

Because unless you know that, again you're, you're in the dark as to what are the benefits and the costs of the decision that is being made. I mean, it's just sort of one of those automatic things that need to be there to make a reasonable decision.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I would, I suppose interject that a distinction could be drawn. There could be some instances in which the merits of continuing a program or demerits of continuing a program are so clear that it really doesn't, that it doesn't depend upon what the resources might be used for. And in other instances of course, you know, it might come down to a question of whether the resources are better used here or there.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: Correct. Correct.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: And so one question it seems to me would be whether, you know, all of these 55 proposals are of the former kind or whether some of them are of the latter kind. If some of them are of the latter kind, then in principle at least, it would be possible to say whether the decision was justified without knowing what use the resources would point to otherwise.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I don't disagree with you, sir.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Miller, is there a motion you wish to make?

SENATOR JON MILLER: Yeah. I will move that the president's proposals to suspend the 55 academic programs be referred to the Academic Policies Committee, and that the Curriculum

Review Committee be directed to advise the Academic Policies Committee on the effects of proposed suspensions on other academic programs.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there a second? Seconded by Senator Allen. Is there debate?

>>: Can we please have a re read of the motion?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Perhaps in a slightly louder voice.

SENATOR JON MILLER: I move that the president's proposals to suspend the 55 academic programs be referred to the Academic Policies Committee, and that the Curriculum Review Committee be directed to advise the Academic Policies Committee on the effects of the proposed suspensions on other academic programs.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Okay. We have a motion, it's been seconded. Is there debate? Hearing none, I take it, Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Yeah, I am aware of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that we have been charged by the president to have the report, he's asked for the report by April 3rd, by our April 3rd meeting. I did not hear any dates within that motion. Would be it be correct for me to take away from this meeting the understanding that the report will be presented to us by the April 3rd meeting or before?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Right. By the deadline for committee reports to be presented in the April 3rd meeting, which would be one week before the April 3rd meeting. That would be correct.

Any other debate or questions? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent.

Is there any other new business to come before the body? Senator Allen.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: Sorry. It's kind of unfinished and kind of new. My recollection was that Senator Bouchard the last time raised a question about the funding formula for graduate assistantships the last time at 85 percent. I just wanted to get an update on whether that had been resolved or, and there was also some confusion about whether that was coming from the grad dean or from the provost and I thought now would be a good time to raise that.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Well, let me just ask, first of all, let me explain. New business would be some sort of motion or resolution that someone wishes to present to the body that would be debatable and either referred to a committee or perhaps adopted.

Good of the order is the agenda item where informational questions would be raised.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: I'll wait then.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: So let me just ask, we may be ready for that. But let me just ask, is there any new business as I just defined it? Okay. Good of the order. Okay.

In response to your question, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee was informed by the provost in its last meeting with the provost that the graduate assistants would be funded at the 100 percent level, meaning the same level as last year.

However, the, as part of a, what I would characterize as a process of sort of partial decentralization of budgeting, that money in each of the deans' budgets will be combined with money for part time faculty and one other item that's slipping my mind right now, which someone will

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: Operating.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: [inaudible]

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: Part time budget and summer school.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Summer school. That's what it was. Summer school. And so it will be within the deans' discretion to allocate that pot of money among those three items. On the other hand, the Executive Committee was also given an assurance by the vice provost that he would keep an eye on those decisions to make sure that undue tradeoffs were not being made.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there anything else for the good of the order? Senator Woods.

SENATOR DOUG WOODS: I wanted to ask the provost, he mentioned there's no subvention anymore for developmental courses except for Central State, Youngstown and Shawnee State. Does that mean that our developmental math and developmental English courses and those things that are offered here at the University of Akron and extensively at Summit and Wayne Colleges, do we have any idea how big of a hit that's gonna be?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Mr. Provost.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: The answer to that is yes, it's being phased out. The answer to the question about the financial implications, the CFO might be better able to answer that question.

>>: He just left.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Dean Midha.

DEAN CHAND MIDHA: Just for the good of the order to Senator Phil Allen, we did receive information that a hundred percent of the last year's allocation of the graduate assistantships has come to the college. All of the department chairs in arts and sciences were informed five days ago, last Friday. So that information has probably not made it yet to your department, but it has been given to all of the chairs.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Anything else for the good of the order? Senator Klein.

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: I suppose I should have mentioned this to you so that you could have mentioned it in the beginning. But in case people didn't know, I just wanted to announce the death of Annetta Karam, she was, sorry, she was actually quite dear to me. She was a student here on campus, our oldest student. She died on January 15th at the age of 98. So will you just read this? She took many classes from many of us. And I think we'll miss her a lot.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: Yes. She took classes from Dr. Klein, she took classes from me. She was born in Akron in 1915. She loved taking courses at the university, and she was involved right up until the week before her death in reading things, learning things, including she was working with Dr. Klein as an independent studies student.

She lived a full, active life and with several husbands, I'm sorry, I think it's worth having a laugh, because she was a wonderful person and she loved life, and she really enjoyed things, and at least in my class she was always ready to laugh at anything that was wonderful or exciting or fun. And for a 98 year old to still be taking courses with us I think shows that we actually as a university have a good impact on our surrounding area.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Would you all please rise for a moment of silence in her memory? Thank you. Is there anything else for the good of the order? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: I wanted to mention in passing this is something the senate has been hearing me comment on, so I will comment on it again.

The other day, the Vice Provost Ramsier was on National Public Radio. Many of you may have heard it. They totally mispronounced Cuyahoga. But his comment was we could not possibly hire more faculty because it costs money. And his figure was that it would increase our instructional costs by 40 percent if we tried to increase the number of faculty.

And I do want to point out that according to the university's own budget figures, full time tenure track faculty are 15 percent of the university's operating budget. This includes benefits. So I think that if we're going to be reallocating resources, faculty are a very important place to reallocate them to.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Bouchard, not to quarrel with the point that you are making, but if I recall correctly, the statement had, was about replacing all of the part time faculty with full time faculty in fairness to Vice Provost Ramsier.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: But the implication was we can't even think of it because we can't even think of it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Anything else for the good of the order?

SENATOR DAVID WITT: I'm sending the associate provost a new calculator. That's it.

>>: He's a physicist. He doesn't need it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I'm sensing that we may be at the end of our rope. Is there a motion to adjourn? So moved by Senator Sterns. Seconded by Senator Lazar. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. We stand adjourned.